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| **Action:** | TSAG is invited to note the updated grouping and prioritization. |

This is an update of the TD667R1 from the TSAG meeting held 29 July – 2 August 2024.

This document groups the proposed actions from the industry engagement workshop for each target entity.

The changes have been discussed in an RG-IEM meeting and the result brings the document up to date for this study period. This document provides various regroupings of the proposed actions from the industry engagement workshop provided in WTSA-24 Contribution 24, Annex 3 [https://www.itu.int/md/T22-WTSA.24-C-0024/en](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.itu.int%2Fmd%2FT22-WTSA.24-C-0024%2Fen&data=05%7C02%7Cscott.mansfield%40ericsson.com%7C0ab907e0345443d2ab3908dd8434bce2%7C92e84cebfbfd47abbe52080c6b87953f%7C0%7C0%7C638812084221096733%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=AbS06qOqqJi3grqMxmtzdQZ3Jxp3A1ghKyofhAolzow%3D&reserved=0).

In Table 1 each proposed action is grouped by target entity. Table 2 provides a proposed top-7 actions. Table 3 provides the proposed prioritization of the high-level themes.

The objective is for each targeted entity to have clarity as to which proposed actions they need to consider for their own work program.

Table 1 - Actions by Target Entity

RG-SOP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Proposed Action** |
| 02 | Investigate how to better coordinate with other forums in order to ensure a good experience for experts and that expertise at ITU-T is kept still |
| 04 | 1. (CSP-market restricted) Research the best ways to refocus work items on customer requirements
2. Research the best ways to attract CSP-market relevant product management roles to participate in the work of the ITU-T
 |
| 07 | Investigate the best ways to deliver an “ITU-T story” / value proposition and promote what ITU-T has |
| 08 | Investigate if it is realistic to have one “ITU-T story” / value proposition or if we need multiple ones by different contexts (Study Group, themes, audiences, etc.) |
| 16  | 1. Assess, measure and explore ways to improve/develop the success factors as ITU-T impact to support its value propositions
2. RG-SOP to take over from when the value proposition is agreed as it directly inputs for the ITU Strategic Plan exercise of 2026
3. Investigate with RG-WTSA if a WTSA Resolution could support this action by a more prescriptive resolve.
 |
| 26 | What can be done to decrease the financial bar of entry for SMEs and startups to join the ITU as sector members |
| 29 | Investigate what is more attractive in opensource or in specific forums of other SDOs including on a breakdown per topics (cybersecurity, cloud, etc.), e.g. why experts go to certain forum vs others and why |
| 30 | Further, assess international and regional standardization landscape, the current trends and business models of SDOs, foras, and venues where standardization is being shaped, to complement workshops learnings. The strategic assessment would further consider topics of SGs and new emerging topics |
| 31 | Study groups are at varying level of relevance, and so there might be not one size fits all approachMeasures for industry engagement to less attractive study groups might not be the same as for the more attractive ones |

RG-WTSA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Proposed Action** |
| 16 | 1. Assess, measure and explore ways to improve/develop the success factors as ITU-T impact to support its value propositions
2. RG-SOP to take over from when the value proposition is agreed as it directly inputs for the ITU Strategic Plan exercise of 2026
3. Investigate with RG-WTSA if a WTSA Resolution could support this action by a more prescriptive resolve.
 |

RG-IEM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Proposed Action** |
| 10 | More/better coordination with other SDOs and open source communities to avoid duplication and so that ITU can be the coordinator to benefit industry. |
| 11 | ITU-T should identify topics where the bridge between technology, policy and strategy is a strength for ITU |
| 24 | How to better recognize that writing code in standards and writing standards should be treated and recognized the same way |
| 27 | Some industry segments (e.g., hyperscalers, software, IoT, other space technology, navigation technology) appear to be absent / underrepresented in ITU-T |

RG-WM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Proposed Action** |
| 05 | Research the best ways to increase the value of the outcomes of the ITU-T by ensuring the right conditions on the inputs as New Work Items in particular optimising global applicability vs requirements for regional diversity |
| 12 | In conjunction with #04 and #05, a new Resolution or modifications to Resolution 68 should reflect that the engagement to improve the value for the industry is complementary to the CTO/CxO meetings but more industry input to the discussion on the new work item bar in TSAG should be reflected |
| 15 | In ITU-T management positions and editors are publicly identified. However, contributors are not, leading to the impossibility for their management line / stakeholders to have any form of KPI and therefore, the only roles that can be rewarded are publicly listed roles, such as editors. This implies that there is no measurement for contributions, except for New Work Items. |
| 21 | 1. Which tools can support and improve collaboration, development of deliverables.
2. Invite potential product candidate vendors to present their solutions to ITU-T.
 |

TSB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Proposed Action** |
| 01 | Investigate new methodologies, e.g. agile methodologies and assess if they can be a success factor for attracting next generation and improve efficiencies |
| 03 | Improve clarity for where industry can identify solutions and engage |
| 04 | 1. (CSP-market restricted) Research the best ways to refocus work items on customer requirements
2. Research the best ways to attract CSP-market relevant product management roles to participate in the work of the ITU-T
 |
| 07 | Investigate the best ways to deliver an “ITU-T story” / value proposition and promote what ITU-T has |
| 08 | Investigate if it is realistic to have one “ITU-T story” / value proposition or if we need multiple ones by different contexts (Study Group, themes, audiences, etc.) |
| 14 | Organise an ad-hoc session to approach the pros and cons of incentivisation and how better conditions could lead to better behaviour and better outcome. |
| 15 | In ITU-T management positions and editors are publicly identified. However, contributors are not, leading to the impossibility for their management line / stakeholders to have any form of KPI and therefore, the only roles that can be rewarded are publicly listed roles, such as editors. This implies that there is no |

Membership

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | **Proposed Action** |
| 14 | Organise an ad-hoc session to approach the pros and cons of incentivisation and how better conditions could lead to better behaviour and better outcome. |

The following table provides a proposed top-7 prioritization.

Table 2 -Proposed Top-7 Prioritization

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Item # | Priority | RG-IEM | RG-WM | RG-SOP | TSB | Theme |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Investigate the best ways to deliver an “ITU-T story” / value proposition and promote what ITU-T has | 7 | 1 | x |   |  x | x | ValuePropositions |
| Investigate the ways to improve coordination with other SDOs and opensource communities to avoid duplication and so that ITU can be the coordinator to benefit industry | 10 | 2 | x |   |   |   | Motivate Coordination |
| Investigate the best way for ITU-T to identify topics that maximise its strength as a bridge between technology, policy and strategy | 11 | 3 | x |   |   |   | Bridge the technologypolicystrategy gap |
| Investigate new methodologies, e.g. agile methodologies and assess if they can be a success factor for attracting next generation and improve efficiencies | 1 | 4 | x | x |   | x | Attract Industry |
| Lower Financial Burden for SMEs | 26 | 5 | x |  |  | x | Attract Industry |
| Increase Velocity of Software-based Standards | 27 | 6 | x | x |  |  | Attract IndustryValue Propositions |
| Embrace Open-Source Tooling | 24 | 7 | x | x |  |  | Attract IndustryValue Propositions |

The following table provides a proposed prioritization of the themes that actions identified during the IEW. The themes are derived from the action point short names found in the Action Plan item tables in TD624/G.

Table 3- Proposed Prioritization of Themes

|  |
| --- |
| Theme |
|  |
| Attract Industry |
| Value Propositions |
| Motivate Coordination |
| Lack of awareness |
| Bridge the technology/policy/strategy gap |
| Common vision and roles |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_